

CW



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,065	10/01/2003	Thomas E. McClaskie	03824-P0128B	7728
24126	7590	01/21/2005	EXAMINER	
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC			PATTERSON, MARIE D	
986 BEDFORD STREET			ART UNIT	
STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619			PAPER NUMBER	

3728

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,065

Applicant(s)

MCCLASKIE, THOMAS E.

Examiner

Marie Patterson

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-13 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Long.

Long shows a shoe/sandal comprising an outsole (2), a sock lining (40), cushion (44), upper/material (5) which partially covers the foot, stitching (48) and a notch (33, figure 2A) substantially as claimed except for the exact thickness of the cushion layer. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a cushion with a thickness of $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{9}{16}$ inch, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

In response to applicants' arguments contesting that the claimed thicknesses are within the ranges of known cushioning insoles, references to Dodds (4501076), Wolpa (4167824), and McElroy (4627179) have been cited as showing of evidence to the contrary. Foam cushion insoles of $\frac{1}{8}$ inch to 1 inch are clearly known and within well known and conventionally used ranges.

4. Claims 1-8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Long in view of either Schwander (967572) or Bray Jr. (5644856).

Long shows a shoe/sandal substantially as claimed except for inarguendo the upper being in the form of conventional "sandal" construction. Schwander or Bray, Jr. teaches that it is obvious and well known to make the uppers of shoes in a conventional partially covering sandal construction as an alternative to full covering uppers. It would have been obvious to form the upper as a conventional sandal as taught by Schwander or Bray, Jr. in the shoe of Long to change the styling of the shoe for fashion/seasonal change/beach use, etc..

In response to applicants' arguments contesting that the claimed thicknesses are within the ranges of known cushioning insoles, references to Dodds (4501076), Wolpa (4167824), and McElroy (4627179) have been cited as showing of evidence to the contrary. Foam cushion insoles of 1/8 inch to 1 inch are clearly known and within well known and conventionally used ranges.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/626139. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim a shoe with an outsole, upper, sock lining, cushion, notching, and stitching except for the prior application does not claim the specific thickness limitations of the cushion. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a cushion with a thickness of $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{9}{16}$ inch, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. The notch claimed in the prior application appears to cover a notch that extends along the side of the outsole as now claimed in this application. In response to applicants' arguments contesting that the claimed thicknesses are within the ranges of known cushioning insoles, references to Dodds (4501076), Wolpa (4167824), and McElroy (4627179) have been cited as showing of evidence to the contrary. Foam cushion insoles of $\frac{1}{8}$ inch to 1 inch are clearly known and within well known and conventionally used ranges.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/15/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicants' arguments that the claimed thickness of between 1/8 inch and 1 1/2 inches is extremely broad and it is noted that most cushioning foam insoles are at least 1/8 inch in order to perform the cushioning function. The Examiner has now cited prior art references to Dodds (4501076), Wolpa (4167824), and McElroy (4627179) as showing of evidence that the claimed ranges are well within the ranges conventionally known and used for foam cushion insoles. Foam cushion insoles of 1/8 inch to 1 inch are clearly known and within well known and conventionally used ranges. The claimed ranges are not considered to be a patentable distinction due to the fact that the ranges have been used and are known.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period; then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3728

1. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Other useful information can be obtained at the PTO Home Page at www.uspto.gov.

In order to avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Center at (703) 872-9306 **(FORMAL FAXES ONLY)**. Please identify Examiner Marie Patterson of Art Unit 3728 at the top of your cover sheet.

Any inquiry concerning the MERITS of this examination from the examiner should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4559. The examiner can normally be reached from 6AM - 4PM Mon-Wed.


Marie Patterson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728